arXiv:1208.1424v1 [math.LO] 7 Aug 2012

ON IDEMPOTENT ULTRAFILTERS IN HIGHER-ORDER REVERSE MATHEMATICS

ALEXANDER P. KREUZER

Abstract. We analyze the strength of the existence of idempotent ultrafilters in higher-order reverse mathematics.

Let $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ be the statement that an idempotent ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$ exists. We show that over ACA_0^ω, the higher-order extension of ACA_0, the statement $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ implies the iterated Hindman's theorem (IHT), as introduced by Hirst, and we show that $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ is Π^1_2-conservative over $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + \mathsf{IHT}$.

In [15] we developed a technique to extract programs of proofs using non-principal ultrafilters. Along these lines we also proved a conservativity results for the statement that a non-principal ultrafilter exists.

In this paper we apply these techniques to idempotent ultrafilters. Roughly, we will show that the existence of idempotent ultrafilters is Π^1_2-conservative over the iterated Hindman's theorem (IHT) as defined by Hirst in [9].

Let $(\mathcal{U})$, $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ be the statement that a non-principal resp. idempotent non-principal ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$ exists. Let RCA_0^ω, ACA_0^ω be the extensions of RCA_0 resp. ACA_0 to higher-order arithmetic as introduced by Kohlenbach in [13]. In RCA_0^ω or ACA_0^ω the statements $(\mathcal{U})$, $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ can be formalized using an object of type $\mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

Further, let Feferman's μ be a functional of type $\mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$f(\mu(f)) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \exists x\, f(x) = 0$$

and let (μ) be the statement that such a functional exists. It is clear that (μ) implies arithmetical comprehension. However, μ is not definable in ACA_0^ω.

In [15] we showed that

- $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega \vdash (\mathcal{U}) \to (\mu)$ and that
- $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + (\mathcal{U})$ is Π^1_2-conservative over ACA_0^ω. Moreover, we proved a program extraction results for this system.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ in the same way. We obtain

- $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega \vdash (\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}}) \to (\mu) \wedge \mathsf{IHT}$, see Theorem 6, and
- $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} + (\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ is Π^1_2-conservative over $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + \mathsf{IHT}$, see Theorem 7. We also obtain a program extraction result for this system.

There are many theorems from combinatorics and Ergodic theory which are established using idempotent ultrafilter, see for instance [8, 2]. Our result provides a method to eliminate the use of idempotent ultrafilters and to extract constructive content of such proofs.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03B30, 03F35, 03F60, 05D10.

Key words and phrases. idempotent ultrafilter, Hindman's theorem, conservation, program extraction, functional interpretation, higher-order reverse mathematics.

The author is supported by the German Science Foundation (DFG Project KO 1737/5-1).

1. Logical Systems

We will work in fragments of Peano arithmetic in all finite types. The set of all finite types $\mathbf{T}$ is defined to be the smallest set that satisfies

$$0 \in \mathbf{T}, \qquad \rho, \tau \in \mathbf{T} \Rightarrow \tau(\rho) \in \mathbf{T}.$$

The type 0 denotes the type of natural numbers and the type $\tau(\rho)$ denotes the type of functions from ρ to τ. The type $0(0)$ is abbreviated by 1 the type $0(0(0))$ by 2. The degree of a type is defined by

$$deg(0) := 0 \qquad deg(\tau(\rho)) := \max(deg(\tau), deg(\rho) + 1).$$

The type of a variable will sometimes be written as superscript of a term.

Equality $=_0$ for type 0 objects will be added as a primitive notion to the systems together with the usual equality axioms. Higher type equality $=_{\tau\rho}$ will be treated as abbreviation:

$$x^{\tau\rho} =_{\tau\rho} y^{\tau\rho} :\equiv \forall z^\rho \, xz =_\tau yz.$$

Define the λ-combinators $\Pi_{\rho,\sigma}, \Sigma_{\rho,\sigma,\tau}$ for $\rho, \sigma, \tau \in \mathbf{T}$ to be the functionals satisfying

$$\Pi_{\rho,\sigma} x^\rho y^\sigma =_\rho x, \qquad \Sigma_{\rho,\sigma,\tau} x^{\tau\sigma\rho} y^{\sigma\rho} z^\rho =_\tau xz(yz).$$

Similar define the recursor R_ρ of type ρ to be the functional satisfying

$$R_\rho 0yz =_\rho y, \qquad R_\rho(Sx^0)yz =_\rho z(R_\rho xyz)x.$$

Let *Gödel's system* T be the $\mathbf{T}$-sorted set of closed terms that can be build up from 0^0, the successor function S^1, the λ-combinators and the recursors R_ρ for all finite types ρ. Using the λ-combinators one easily sees that T is closed under λ-abstraction, see [18]. Denote by T_0 and T_1 the fragments of Gödel's system T, where primitive recursion is restricted to recursors R_0 resp. R_0 and R_1. The system T_0 corresponds to the extension of Kleene's primitive recursive functionals to mixed types, see [11], whereas full system T corresponds to Gödel's primitive recursive functionals, see [6]. By $T_0[F]$ we will denote the system resulting from adding a function(al) F to T_0.

The system RCA_0^ω is defined to be the extension of the term system T_0 by Σ^0_1-induction, the extensionality axioms

$$(\mathsf{E}_{\rho,\tau})\colon \forall z^{\tau\rho}, x^\rho, y^\rho \, (x =_\rho y \rightarrow zx =_\tau zy)$$

for all $\tau, \rho \in \mathbf{T}$, and the schema of quantifier free choice restricted to choice of numbers over functions ($\mathsf{QF}\text{-}\mathsf{AC}^{1,0}$), i.e.

$$\forall f^1 \, \exists x^0 \, \mathsf{A}_{qf}(f, x) \rightarrow \exists F^2 \, \forall f^1 \, \mathsf{A}_{qf}(f, F(f)).$$

This schema is the higher-order equivalent to recursive comprehension (Δ^0_1-CA). (Strictly speaking the system RCA_0^ω was defined in [13] to contain only quantifier free induction instead of Σ^0_1-induction. Since Σ^0_1-induction is provable in that system, we may also add it directly.) The systems WKL_0^ω, ACA_0^ω are defined to be $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + \mathsf{WKL}$ resp. $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + \Pi^0_1$-$\mathsf{CA}$.

All of these systems are conservative over their second-order counterparts, where the second-order part is given by functions instead of sets. These second-order systems can then be interpreted in RCA_0, resp. WKL_0, ACA_0. See [13].

We will also use the following result by Hunter.

Theorem 1 ([10, Theorem 2.5])**.** *The system* $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu)$ *is conservative over* ACA_0.

Note that the result is proven using a model construction and does not provide any method which would translate a proof of an analytic statement in $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu)$ to a proof in ACA_0. However, for Π^1_2-statements there is such a method, see [1, Theorem 8.3.4] and [5].

The system RCA_0^ω has a functional interpretation (always combined with the elimination of extensionality and a negative translation) in T_0. The system ACA_0^ω has a functional interpretation in $T_0[\mu]$, see [13, 1, 14].

Definition 2 (idempotent non-principal ultrafilter, $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$)**.** Let $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ be the statement that there exists an idempotent non-principal ultrafilter (on $\mathbb{N}$):

$$(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})\colon \begin{cases} \exists \mathcal{U}^2 \big(\forall X \ (X \in \mathcal{U} \lor \overline{X} \in \mathcal{U}) \\ \qquad \land \forall X^1, Y^1 \ (X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U} \to Y \in \mathcal{U}) \\ \qquad \land \forall X^1, Y^1 \ (X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \to (X \cap Y) \in \mathcal{U}) \\ \qquad \land \forall X^1 \ (X \in \mathcal{U} \to \forall n \, \exists k > n \, (k \in X)) \\ \qquad \land \forall X^1 \ (X \in \mathcal{U} \to \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid X - n \in \mathcal{U} \} \in \mathcal{U}) \\ \qquad \land \forall X^1 \ (\mathcal{U}(X) =_0 \operatorname{sg}(\mathcal{U}(X)) =_0 \mathcal{U}(\lambda n.\, \operatorname{sg}(X(n))))\big) \end{cases}$$

Here $X \in \mathcal{U}$ is an abbreviation for $\mathcal{U}(X) =_0 0$. The type 1 variables X, Y are viewed as characteristic functions of sets, where $n \in X$ is defined to be $X(n) = 0$. The operation $\cap$ is defined as taking the pointwise maximum of the characteristic functions. With this, the intersection of two sets can be expressed in a quantifier free way. The last line of the definition states that $\mathcal{U}$ yields the same value for different characteristic functions of the same set and that $\mathcal{U}(X) \le 1$.

For notational ease we will usually add a Skolem constant $\mathcal{U}$ and denote this also with $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$.

The second line in the definition of $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ is equivalent to the following axiom usually found in the axiomatization of (ultra)filters:

$$\forall X, Y \ (X \subseteq Y \land X \in \mathcal{U} \to Y \in \mathcal{U}) \,.$$

We avoided this statement in $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{idem}})$ since $\subseteq$ cannot be expressed in a quantifier free way.

2. Iterated Hindman's theorem

Let X be an infinite set of natural numbers and $(x_i)_i$ be a strictly ascending enumeration of it. We will write

$$\mathrm{FS}(X) = \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_i) := \{ x_{i_1} + \cdots + x_{i_k} \mid i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \}$$

for the set of finite sums of X.

Definition 3 ([7])**.** *Hindman's theorem* (HT) is the statement that for each coloring $c\colon \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow 2$ of the natural numbers there exists an infinite set X such that $\mathrm{FS}(X)$ is homogeneous for c.

For Hindman's theorem it is known that it implies ACA_0 and is implied by ACA_0^+ that is ACA_0 plus the statement that for each set X the ω-Turing jump $X^{(\omega)}$ exists, see [4]. It is an open problem to determine the exact logical strength of HT, see [16].

Definition 4 ([9])**.** *Iterated Hindman's theorem* (IHT) is the statement that for each sequence of colorings $c_k\colon \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow 2$ there exists an ascending sequence $(x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that for each k the set $\mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=k}^{\infty})$ is homogeneous for c_k.

Theorem 5 (RCA_0)**.**

(i) *Hindman's theorem is equivalent to the statement that for each infinite set Y and for each coloring $c\colon \mathrm{FS}(Y) \longrightarrow 2$ there exists an infinite subset $X \subseteq \mathrm{FS}(Y)$ such that $\mathrm{FS}(X)$ is homogeneous for c.*

(ii) *Similarly, iterated Hindman's theorem is equivalent to the statement that for each infinite set Y and for each sequence of colorings $c_k\colon \mathrm{FS}(Y) \longrightarrow 2$ there exists a sequence $(x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathrm{FS}(Y)$ which satisfies the conclusion of* IHT.

Proof. (i) follows from Lemma 2.1 of [3], see also [2], and noting that the proof of the equivalences formalizes in RCA_0. (ii) follows by iterating the construction of (i). ☐

Theorem 6. $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega \vdash (\mathcal{U}_{idem}) \rightarrow \mathsf{IHT}$

Proof. By noting that an idempotent non-principal ultrafilter is an *almost downward translation ultrafilter*, in the sense of [9], for any countable almost translation algebra we see that this theorem follows from Theorem 3 of [9]. ☐

The main results of this paper are the following theorems.

Theorem 7. *The system $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} + (\mathcal{U}_{idem})$ is Π^1_2-conservative over $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + \mathsf{IHT}$.*

Along the same lines, we can prove the following program extraction result.

Theorem 8 (program extraction)**.** *Let $\forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f,g)$ be a Π^1_2-sentence. If*

$$\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} + (\mathcal{U}_{idem}) \vdash \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f,g)$$

then one can extract from a proof a term $t \in T_1[\mu]$ such that

$$\forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f, tf).$$

Theorem 7 is optimal in the sense that $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})$ cannot be Π^1_2-conservative over any system not containing IHT because of Theorem 6. The program extraction of Theorem 8 is not faithful. For type reason $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})$ does not imply the totality of R_1. However, we do not have a faithful functional interpretation for IHT yet and just use R_1 and μ to emulate ACA_0^+.

The proofs of these theorems are similar to the proof of Theorem 4 in [15]. They proceed roughly in the following steps.

(1) Let $\forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f,g)$ be a Π^1_2-statement such that

$$\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} + (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}}) \vdash \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f,g).$$

Using the functional interpretation and a program normalization we show that each application of $\mathcal{U}$ in this proof is of the form $\mathcal{U}(t[n^0])$ for a term t that contains only n free and with $\lambda n.t \in T_0[\mathcal{U}]$. (This step does not differ from the first step in [15].)

(2) We now construct provably in $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT}$ a—so called—downward translation partial ultrafilter, which acts like an idempotent ultrafilter on the sets that occur in the proof. The idempotent ultrafilter is then replaced by this object in the proof.

(3) Applying Theorem 1 to this yields Theorem 7.

(4) For Theorem 8 we notice that in $T_1[\mu]$ we can define a functional solving IHT and thus we can explicitly describe the downward translation partial ultrafilter we construction in the second step. With this we get a program witnessing g.

3. Downward translation partial ultrafilter

In [15] we built a—so called—partial non-principal ultrafilter which acted on the algebra of sets that were used in a proof like a non-principal ultrafilter. We will now briefly recall the notions of algebra and partial non-principal ultrafilter. After this, we will introduce the notions of *downward translation algebra* and *downward translation partial ultrafilter* which will be suitable for handling idempotent ultrafilters.

Definition 9.

- An *algebra* is a set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ of subsets of natural numbers, that is closed under complement, finite unions and finite intersection.
- For an algebra $\mathcal{A}$ we call a set $\mathcal{F}$ a *partial non-principal ultrafilter* for $\mathcal{A}$ if $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the axioms for a non-principal ultrafilter relativized to $\mathcal{A}$, i.e.

$$\begin{cases} \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{A}\ \big(X \in \mathcal{F} \lor \overline{X} \in \mathcal{F}\big) \\ \land \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{A}\ (X \cap Y \in \mathcal{F} \to Y \in \mathcal{F}) \\ \land \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{A}\ (X, Y \in \mathcal{F} \to (X \cap Y) \in \mathcal{F}) \\ \land \forall X \in \mathcal{A}\ (X \in \mathcal{F} \to \forall n\, \exists k > n\, k \in X) \\ \land \forall X^1\ (\mathcal{F}(X) =_0 \mathrm{sg}(\mathcal{F}(X)) =_0 \mathcal{F}(\lambda n.\, \mathrm{sg}(X(n))) \,. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

(Note that we do not require $\mathcal{F}$ to be a subset of $\mathcal{A}$ as we did in [15]. This restriction was actually not used in [15] and could have been omitted.)

Definition 10.

- An algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is called *downward translation algebra* if it is closed under downward translations, i.e.

$$X \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ (X - n \in \mathcal{A})\,.$$

- A *downward translation partial ultrafilter* is a partial non-principal filter $\mathcal{F}$ for a downward translation algebra $\mathcal{A}$ which in addition to (1) satisfies the following axiom

$$\forall X \in \mathcal{F}\ (\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid X - n \in \mathcal{F}\} \in \mathcal{F})\,. \tag{2}$$

Note that we do not require the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid X - n \in \mathcal{F}\}$ to be in the algebra $\mathcal{A}$.

In other words, a downward translation partial ultrafilter for $\mathcal{A}$ is an object which satisfies the axioms $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})$ but where X, Y is restricted to $\mathcal{A}$.

Like in [15] we will mostly work with countable downward translation algebras $\mathcal{A}$ which are given by a sequence of sets $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. The characteristic function of $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is then given by

$$\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \exists i\ (A_i = X), \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Such a characteristic function can be defined using μ.

It is easy to see that in RCA_0^ω each sequence of sets $(A_i)_i$ can be extended to form a countable downward translation algebra.

The partial filters we will build will be of the following form

$$\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i) := \{\, X \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid \exists m \, \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=m}^\infty) \subseteq X \,\}$$

where $(x_i)_i$ is a strictly ascending sequence of natural numbers.

One checks that $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ is closed under finite intersections, supersets and contains only infinite sets. Thus, it is a filter.

Lemma 11. *Let $(x_i)_i$ be an ascending sequence of natural numbers. Then $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ satisfies* (2)*.*

In particular, if $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ is a partial non-principal ultrafilter for a downward translation algebra $\mathcal{A}$ then it is already a downward translation partial ultrafilter for $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$. By definition there is an m, such that $\mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=m}^\infty) \subseteq X$.

It is sufficient to show that $\mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=m}^\infty) \subseteq \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid X - n \in \mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)\}$ or in other words that for each $n \in \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=m}^\infty)$ we have $X - n \in \mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$.

Indeed each such n can be written as $n = x_{i_1} + x_{i_2} + \cdots + x_{i_k}$ for distinct $i_1, \dots, i_k \geq m$. Let now $l := \max\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} + 1$. Then for each $n' \in \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=l}^\infty)$ the number $n' + n$ is an element of $\mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=m}^\infty)$ or in other words $\mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=l}^\infty) \subseteq \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=m}^\infty) - n$. Thus, $\mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=l}^\infty) \subseteq X - n$, with this $X - n \in \mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$, and the lemma follows. □

Lemma 12. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a downward translation algebra. If for a sequence $(x_i)_i$ the set $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ is a downward translation partial ultrafilter for $\mathcal{A}$ then for any sequence $(y_i)_i \subseteq \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_i)$ we have $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i) \cap \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{F}((y_i)_i) \cap \mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. By definition of $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ we have that $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i) \subseteq \mathcal{F}((y_i)_i)$. Moreover, the set $\mathcal{F}((y_i)_i)$ is a filter and, therefore, contains for each X at most one of X and $\overline{X}$. Now $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ is maximal in $\mathcal{A}$ in the sense that for each $X \in \mathcal{A}$ either X or $\overline{X}$ is an element in $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$. Thus, both filters must be equal on $\mathcal{A}$. □

Theorem 13. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a countable downward translation algebra and let $(x_i)_i$ be a sequence such that $\mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ is a downward translation partial ultrafilter for $\mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT}$ proves that for each countable downward translation algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = (\tilde{A}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$ there exists a sequence $(y_i)_i \subseteq \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_i)$, such that $\mathcal{F}((y_i)_i)$ is a downward translation partial ultrafilter for $\mathcal{A}$.*

In particular, $\mathcal{F}((y_i)_i) \supseteq \mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ and $\mathcal{F}((y_i)_i) \cap \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{F}((x_i)_i) \cap \mathcal{A}$.

Proof. Let

$$c_k(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in \tilde{A}_k, \\ 1 & \text{if } x \notin \tilde{A}_k. \end{cases}$$

By IHT and Theorem 5 there exists a sequence $(y_i)_i \subseteq \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_i)$ such that $\mathrm{FS}((y_i)_{i=k}^\infty)$ is homogeneous for c_k, i.e. $\mathrm{FS}((y_i)_{i=k}^\infty)$ is contained in either $\tilde{A}_k$ or $\overline{\tilde{A}_k}$. Thus, for each k the filter $\mathcal{F}((y_i)_i)$ contains either $\tilde{A}_k$ or $\overline{\tilde{A}_k}$ and is, therefore, a downward translation partial ultrafilter for $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. □

Remark 14 (Stone-Čech compactification). The filter of the form $\mathcal{F}((x_i))$ can be viewed as the following closed set of the Stone-Čech compactification $\beta\mathbb{N}$:

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty}\{\mathcal{U}\in\beta\mathbb{N}\mid \mathrm{FS}((x_i)_{i=m}^{\infty})\in\mathcal{U}\}$$

The use of such filters/closed sets is inspired by [2, Theorem 2.5] where it is shown that such sets contain idempotent ultrafilter.

4. Proof theory

We proceed like in [15]. The elimination of extensionality [15, Lemma 7] is also applicable to $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})$ instead of $(\mathcal{U})$ since

$$(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})\equiv(\mathcal{U})\wedge\forall X^1\ (X\in\mathcal{U}\to\{\,k\in\mathbb{N}\mid X-k\in\mathcal{U}\,\}\in\mathcal{U})$$

and the added axiom contains only quantification over variable of degree ≤ 1. Therefore, it is not changed by the elimination of extensionality translation. We obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 15 (elimination of extensionality)**.** *If* A *is a sentence that contains only quantification over variables of degree* ≤ 1 *and*

$$\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega\vdash(\mathcal{U}_{idem})\to\mathsf{A}$$

then

$$\widehat{\mathsf{WE}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}}^\omega\restriction+\mathsf{QF}\text{-}\mathsf{AC}^{1,0}\vdash(\mathcal{U}_{idem})\to\mathsf{A}.$$

Since μ *is provably extensional the statement remains true if one adds* (μ) *to both systems.*

We will also use the following term normalization result.

Theorem 16 (term-normalization for degree 2, [15, Theorem 8], [12, 1])**.** *Let* $F_1,\dots,F_n$ *be constants of degree* ≤ 2.

For every term $t^1\in T_0[F_1,\dots,F_n]$ *there is a term* $\tilde{t}\in T_0[F_0,\dots,F_{n-1}]$ *with*

$$\widehat{\mathsf{WE}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}}^\omega\restriction\vdash t=_1\tilde{t}$$

and such that every occurrence of an F_i *in* $\tilde{t}$ *is of the form*

$$F_i(\tilde{t}_0[y^0],\dots,\tilde{t}_{k-1}[y^0]).$$

Here k *is the arity of* F_i*, and* $\tilde{t}_j[y^0]$ *are fixed terms whose only free variable is* y^0.

The axiom $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})$ can be prenexed to the following statement.

$$\begin{aligned}\exists\mathcal{U}^2\,\forall X^1,Y^1\,\forall n\,\exists k\,\big(\ &\forall X\ \big(X\in\mathcal{U}\vee\overline{X}\in\mathcal{U}\big)\\ &\wedge\ (X\cap Y\in\mathcal{U}\to Y\in\mathcal{U})\\ &\wedge\ (X,Y\in\mathcal{U}\to(X\cap Y)\in\mathcal{U})\\ &\wedge\ (X\in\mathcal{U}\to(k>n\wedge k\in X))\\ &\wedge\ (X\in\mathcal{U}\to\{\,n\in\mathbb{N}\mid X-n\in\mathcal{U}\,\}\in\mathcal{U})\\ &\wedge\ (\mathcal{U}(X)=_0\mathrm{sg}(\mathcal{U}(X))=_0\mathcal{U}(\lambda n.\,\mathrm{sg}(X(n))))\,\big)\end{aligned}$$

By coding the set X,Y together we obtain the following

$$\exists\mathcal{U}^2\,\forall Z^1\,\forall n\,\exists k\,(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})_{qf}(\mathcal{U},Z,n,k)$$

where $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})_{qf}$ is the quantifier free matrix of the above statement.

An application of $\mathsf{QF\text{-}AC}^{1,0}$ yields

$$\exists \mathcal{U}^2\, \exists K^2\, \forall Z\, \forall n\, (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})_{qf}(\mathcal{U}, Z, n, KnZ) \tag{3}$$

The variable K may always be chosen to be the following functional definable using μ.

$$K'(n,X) := \begin{cases} \min\{k \in X \mid k > n\} & \text{if exists,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Therefore, the real difficulty is the construction of a suitable $\mathcal{U}$.

Proof of Theorem 7. Let $\forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f,g)$ a Π^1_2-statement not containing $\mathcal{U}$ or μ and provable in $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} + (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})$. Since $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})$ implies (μ), ACA_0 and IHT we arrive at

$$\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}}) \vdash \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f,g).$$

Using μ one can find quantifier free formula $\mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f,g)$, which also does not contain $\mathcal{U}$, such that $\mathsf{A}(f,g) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f,g)$. Together with the deduction theorem we arrive at the following.

$$\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu) \vdash (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}}) \rightarrow \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f,g)$$

Applying the elimination of extensionality we get

$$\widehat{\mathsf{WE\text{-}PA}}^\omega{\restriction} + \mathsf{QF\text{-}AC}^{1,0} + (\mu) \vdash (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}}) \rightarrow \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f,g).$$

After reintroducing a variable $\mathcal{U}$ for the ultrafilter and using (3) we obtain

$$\big(\exists \mathcal{U}^2\, \exists K^2\, \forall Z\, \forall n\, (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})_{qf}(\mathcal{U}, Z, n, KnZ)\big) \rightarrow \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f,g).$$

Pulling out the quantifiers we get

$$\forall f\, \forall \mathcal{U}^2\, \forall K^2\, \exists Z^1\, \exists n\, \exists g\, (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})_{qf}(\mathcal{U}, Z, n, KnZ) \rightarrow \mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f,g).$$

A functional interpretation yields $t_Z, t_n, t_g \in T_0[\mu, \mathcal{U}, K, f]$ such that

$$\widehat{\mathsf{WE\text{-}PA}}^\omega{\restriction} + (\mu) \vdash \forall f\, \forall \mathcal{U}^2\, \forall K^2\, (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})_{qf}(\mathcal{U}, t_Z, t_n, Kt_nt_Z) \rightarrow \mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f, t_g). \tag{5}$$

Applying Theorem 16 to t_Z, t_n, t_g we obtain terms t'_Z, t'_n, t'_g, which are provably equal and where every occurrence of $\mathcal{U}, K$ is of the form

$$\mathcal{U}(t[j^0]) \quad \text{resp.} \quad K(n^0, t[j^0])$$

for a $t \in T_0[\mu, \mathcal{U}, K, f]$.

Let $(t_i)_{i<n}$ be the list of all of these terms t to which $\mathcal{U}$ and K are applied. Assume that this list is partially ordered according to the subterm ordering, i.e. if t_i is a subterm of t_j then $i < j$.

We now build for each f a downward translation partial ultrafilter $\mathcal{F}$, which acts on these occurrences like a real idempotent non-principal ultrafilter. For this fix an arbitrary f.

The filter $\mathcal{F}$ is build by iterated applications of Theorem 13: We start with the trivial downward translation algebra

$$\mathcal{A}_{-1} := \{\, X \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid \text{X is finite or cofinite} \,\}$$

and the Frèchet filter

$$\mathcal{F}_{-1} := \{\, X \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid \text{X is cofinite} \,\} = \mathcal{F}((i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}).$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{F}_{-1}$ is a partial non-principal ultrafilter for $\mathcal{A}_{-1}$. By Lemma 11 it is also a downward translation partial ultrafilter for $\mathcal{A}_{-1}$.

Assume now that $\mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ are already defined. Let $\mathcal{A}_i$ be the downward translation algebra spanned by $\mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ and the sets described by t_i where $\mathcal{U}, K$ are replaced by $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ and K' from (4), i.e. $\big(t_i[\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{F}_{i-1}, K/K'](j)\big)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}((y_i)_i)$ be the extension of $\mathcal{F}_{i-1} = \mathcal{F}((x_i)_i)$ to the new downward translation algebra $\mathcal{A}_i$ as constructed in Theorem 13.

Since $\mathcal{U}$ is in t_i only applied to subterms of t_i we obtain by the construction of the filter, see Lemma 12, that

$$t_i[\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{F}_{j-1}, K/K'] =_1 t_i[\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{F}_{j'-1}, K/K'] \qquad \text{for all } j, j' > i$$

For the resulting downward translation partial ultrafilter $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_n$ we obtain that

$$(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})_{qf}(\mathcal{F}, t_Z[\mathcal{F}, K', f], t_n[\mathcal{F}, K', f], K' t_n[\mathcal{F}, K', f] t_Z[\mathcal{F}, K', f]).$$

In total we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} \vdash \\ &\qquad \forall f\, \exists \mathcal{F}\, (\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{idem}})_{qf}(\mathcal{F}, t_Z[\mathcal{F}, K', f], t_n[\mathcal{F}, K', f], K' t_n[\mathcal{F}, K', f] t_Z[\mathcal{F}, K', f]).\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (5) we get

$$\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} \vdash \forall f\, \exists \mathcal{F}\, \mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f, t_g[\mu, \mathcal{F}, K, f])$$

and hence

$$\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} \vdash \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}'_{qf}(f, g). \tag{6}$$

Replacing A'_{qf} with the equivalent formula A which does not contain μ we obtain

$$\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\mu) + \mathsf{IHT} \vdash \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f, g).$$

Noting that IHT is analytic and applying Theorem 1 we get

$$\mathsf{ACA}_0 + \mathsf{IHT} \vdash \forall f\, \exists g\, \mathsf{A}(f, g).$$

This proves the theorem. ☐

Proof of Theorem 8. In $T_1[\mu]$ one can define a functional which maps a set X to its ω-Turing jump. Therefore, the functional interpretation of ACA_0^+ can be solved in $T_1[\mu]$. Since $\mathsf{ACA}_0^+ \vdash \mathsf{IHT}$, we can find a solution of the functional interpretation of (6). This implies Theorem 8. ☐

Concluding remarks. In [17] Towsner also considers ultrafilter in reverse mathematics. He works with second order systems and formalizes the ultrafilter as a predicate on the second order sort of the system. The extension of ACA_0 is denoted by $\mathsf{ACA}_0 + \exists\mathfrak{U}$. It is easy to see that $\mathsf{ACA}_0 + \exists\mathfrak{U}$ can be embedded into $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mathcal{U})$. It is not known whether $\mathsf{ACA}_0^\omega + (\mathcal{U})$ is conservative over $\mathsf{ACA}_0 + \exists\mathfrak{U}$, since the techniques usually used show that systems sorted into all finite types are conservative over a second order system require continuity and $\mathcal{U}$ obviously is not continuous. It might be possible to adapt the construction of Hunter (Theorem 1) to obtain such a conservativity result.

Towsner asked whether $\mathsf{ACA}_0 + \exists\mathfrak{U} +$"every element of $\mathfrak{U}$ is an IP-set" does imply ACA_0^+ (Question 4.4). Since this system implies IHT and idempotent ultrafilters contain only IP-sets, Theorem 7 reduces this question to the open problem whether IHT implies ACA_0^+. Theorem 7 also gives a partial answer to Question 4.6 of [17].

References

1. Jeremy Avigad and Solomon Feferman, *Gödel's functional ("Dialectica") interpretation*, Handbook of proof theory, Stud. Logic Found. Math., vol. 137, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998, pp. 337–405. MR 1640329
2. Vitaly Bergelson, *Ultrafilters, IP sets, dynamics, and combinatorial number theory*, Ultrafilters across mathematics, Contemp. Math., vol. 530, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, pp. 23–47. MR 2757532
3. Vitaly Bergelson and Neil Hindman, *Additive and multiplicative Ramsey theorems in* $\mathbf{N}$*—some elementary results*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **2** (1993), no. 3, 221–241. MR 1264030
4. Andreas R. Blass, Jeffry L. Hirst, and Stephen G. Simpson, *Logical analysis of some theorems of combinatorics and topological dynamics*, Logic and combinatorics (Arcata, Calif., 1985), Contemp. Math., vol. 65, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 125–156. MR 891245
5. Solomon Feferman, *Theories of finite type related to mathematical practice*, Handbook of mathematical logic (Jon Barwise, ed.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977, pp. 913–971. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Math., Vol. 90.
6. Kurt Gödel, *Über eine bisher noch nicht benützte Erweiterung des finiten Standpunktes*, Dialectica **12** (1958), 280–287. MR 0102482
7. Neil Hindman, *Finite sums from sequences within cells of a partition of* N, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A **17** (1974), 1–11. MR 0349574
8. Neil Hindman and Dona Strauss, *Algebra in the Stone-Čech compactification*, de Gruyter Textbook, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2012, Theory and applications, Second revised and extended edition. MR 2893605
9. Jeffry L. Hirst, *Hindman's theorem, ultrafilters, and reverse mathematics*, J. Symbolic Logic **69** (2004), no. 1, 65–72. MR 2039345
10. James Hunter, *Higher-order reverse topology*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008, `http://www.math.wisc.edu/~lempp/theses/hunter.pdf`.
11. Stephen C. Kleene, *Recursive functionals and quantifiers of finite types. I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **91** (1959), 1–52. MR 0102480
12. Ulrich Kohlenbach, *On the no-counterexample interpretation*, J. Symbolic Logic **64** (1999), no. 4, 1491–1511. MR 1780065
13. ———, *Higher order reverse mathematics*, Reverse mathematics 2001, Lect. Notes Log., vol. 21, Assoc. Symbol. Logic, La Jolla, CA, 2005, pp. 281–295. MR 2185441
14. ———, *Applied proof theory: Proof interpretations and their use in mathematics*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer Verlag, 2008. MR 2445721
15. Alexander P. Kreuzer, *Non-principal ultrafilters, program extraction and higher-order reverse mathematics*, J. Math. Log. **12** (2012), no. 1.
16. Antonio Montalbán, *Open questions in reverse mathematics*, Bull. Symbolic Logic **17** (2011), no. 3, 431–454. MR 2856080
17. Henry Towsner, *Ultrafilters in reverse mathematics*, `arXiv:1109.3902`.
18. Anne S. Troelstra (ed.), *Metamathematical investigation of intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 344, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1973. MR 0325352

Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Schlossgartenstrasse 7, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany

E-mail address: `akreuzer@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`

URL: `http://www.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~akreuzer`